

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 17, 2005. Prior to entry of this amendment, Claims 1-8 are currently pending in the application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 4-6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kumar* (U.S. 2005/0060154 A1) in view of *Krishnakumar et al.* (U.S. 6,014,087), Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kumar* in view of *Krishnakumar*, and further in view of *Ziniel* (U.S. 5,390,341), Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kumar* in view of *Krishnakumar*, and further in view of *Sharma et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0223461), and Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kumar* in view of *Krishnakumar*, and further view of *Kobayashi* (U.S. 6,721,564).

Please amend Claim 1 as set forth herein. Please cancel Claim 3. Claim 1 has been amended to include the elements of Claim 3.

Claims 1-8 of the present application are all directed to methods for connecting a mobile communication terminal by Bluetooth wireless communication, with Claims 1, 4, and 6 being in independent form.


With regard to independent Claims 4 and 6, each of these claims recites transmitting a predetermined automatic link connection attempt number from a master to a slave. In rejecting independent Claims 4 and 6, the Examiner cites FIGs. 1 and 2, and column 2, lines 9-15, and column 3, line 64 through column 4, line 12, of *Krishnakumar* as teaching this recitation. These sections teach network tracking the number of times a connection attempt is made, i.e., will make 3 attempts before giving a connection failure message, *Krishnakumar* makes no teaching of transmitting a predetermined automatic link connection attempt number from a master to a slave in order to inform the slave of the maximum amount of times it may attempt a connection with the master. Accordingly, we believe the Examiner is incorrect in rejecting Claims 4 and 6 as being unpatentable over *Kumar* in view of *Krishnakumar*. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 4 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1, the claim has been amended to recite “displaying a message requesting input of the automatic link connection attempt number upon receipt of key input selecting an automatic link connection menu, setting the automatic link connection attempt number corresponding to a received digit key, and setting an automatic link connection mode.” *Kumar* merely alerts a user to determine whether or not a connection is continued or discontinued. This is not displaying a message requesting input of the automatic link connection attempt number upon receipt of key input selecting an automatic link connection menu, setting the automatic link connection attempt number corresponding to a received digit key, and setting an automatic link connection mode as recited in amended Claim 1. *Krishnakumar* does not cure this defect. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely Claims 1, 2 and 4-8 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant’s attorney at the number given below.

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, NY 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516  
PJF/DMO/MJM/las

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant(s)